

REMARKS

The applicant has carefully reviewed the official action mailed on September 2, 2010, and the references cited therein. By way of this response, claims 1 and 49-51 have been amended. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks.

The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the official action, claims 1, 3, 5-51, 53 and 55-98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Davis (U.S. 5,796,952) in view of Astiz (U.S. 5,918,012) and Parthasarathy (U.S. 7,634,772); claims 2 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Davis in view of Astiz, Parthasarathy and Welsh (U.S. 5,374,951); and claims 4 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Davis in view of Astiz, Parthasarathy and Lu (U.S. 2003/0110485).

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a method performed by a software agent of a first entity measuring the exposure of an individual to electronic media using a processor to obtain information identifying the electronic media from a cooperative media handler, wherein the cooperative media handler performs a dynamically configurable media research task that is associated with the handling of electronic media by the cooperative media handler, wherein the media research task is dynamically configurable by changing the handling of the electronic media by the media handler to filter the media information. The cited portion of the art cited in the present action fails to describe, teach or suggest a media research task that is dynamically configurable by changing the handling of the electronic media by the media handler to filter the media information, as recited in claim 1.

The present action admits on page 5 that “the references [Davis and Astiz, which were the references discussed prior to this remark] do not explicitly discuss that

any of the software may be dynamically configured.” Therefore, Davis and Astiz fail to describe, teach or suggest a media research task that is dynamically configurable by changing the handling of the electronic media by the media handler to filter the media information, as recited in claim 1.

The present action asserts Parthasarathy teaches remotely downloading or installing newer versions of a range of software applications. However, the cited portions of Parthasarathy fail to describe dynamically configuring a media task with respect to filtering. Col. 2, lines 1-39 describe inserting multimedia such as animated buttons, scrolling banners, and blinking lights, into an HTML document and searching for new helper applications for processing the media. Col. 3, lines 15-25 of Parthasarathy describe a code verification module that verifies that downloaded software is safe to install. Col. 8, lines 20-24 of Parthasarathy describes a data download module downloading a more recent version of a software component. Col. 17, lines 40-45 of Parthasarathy describe checking files to install on a computer with respect to an installed local version. Col. 28, lines 13-16 of Parthasarathy describe embedding tags into an HTML document. None of these cited portions describes, teaches or suggests a media research task that is dynamically configurable by changing the handling of the electronic media by the media handler to filter the media information, as recited in claim 1.

References Welsh and Lu were not cited for the premise of describing a media research task that is dynamically configurable by changing the handling of the electronic media by the media handler to filter the media information.

Therefore, the cited portions of Davis, Astiz, Parthasarathy, Welsh, and/or Lu, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach or suggest a media research task that is dynamically configurable by changing the handling of the electronic media by the

media handler to filter the media information, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 and all claims dependent thereon are in condition for allowance, for this reason alone.

Independent claims 49-51 and their dependents contain recitations similar to those recitations of claim 1 discussed above. Therefore, the remaining claims are also believed to be patentable for reasons similar to those set forth above in connection with independent claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. If there are any remaining issues in this application, the applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

The applicant believes no payment is due for this submission. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required to Deposit Account No. 50-2455.

Respectfully submitted,

HANLEY, FLIGHT & ZIMMERMAN, LLC
USPTO Customer Number 81905
150 S. Wacker Drive
Suite 2100
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 580-1020

By: /Joseph T. Jasper/
Joseph T. Jasper
Registration No.: 50,833
Attorney for Applicant

December 2, 2010